

REMARKS

In this paper, claims 13 and 18 are currently amended. After entry of the above amendment, claims 3-5, 7-9, 13-14 and 18-21 are pending, and claims 1, 2, 6, 10-12, 15-17 and 22-25 have been canceled.

Claims 3-5, 7-9 and 13-14 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Otomo (JP 2,679,162) in view of Shima, et al (JP 56-134,089). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed.

Independent claims 13 and 18 have been amended to clarify that the first second rotor member and the second second rotor member are pressed towards the first rotor member with a compressive force by the plurality of fasteners and the hub mounting member to prevent delamination of the first rotor member, the first second rotor member and the second second rotor member from each other. Support for this amendment may be found in Fig. 7, which shows a fixing pin in the form of a conventional rivet that is press-deformed to form the structure shown in Fig. 7, as well as by the statement in the last sentence of paragraph [0026] that the first and second fixing components (90a) and (90b) may be fixed to the tips of arms (117c) by a hexagonal head bolt (122c). Bolts create compressive forces on the components attached.


Otomo discloses a disk brake rotor (4) comprising a first rotor member (1) disposed between a pair of second rotor members (2). A plurality of attaching holes (5) are formed through disk brake rotor (4), and a cylindrical collar (7) is fitted in each attaching hole (5). A fastener (9) extends through each collar (7) to mount disk brake rotor (4) to a mounting member (not shown). Each collar (7) extends from the external side surface of one second rotor member (2) to the opposite external side surface of the other second rotor member (2). As a result, all pressing forces of fastener (9) are communicated through collar (7), so rotor members (1) and (2) are not pressed towards each other with a compressive force by the fastener and the hub mounting member to prevent delamination of the first rotor member and the first second rotor member from each other.

The office action states that Otomo's fasteners (9) are capable of pressing against the laminate to prevent delamination of the rotor. The rationale is that forces that resist movement of the rotors away from each other are necessarily oriented in a direction forcing the rotors toward each other. However, such a force is not a compressive force.

Claims 18-21 were rejected under 35 U.S.C. §103(a) as being unpatentable over Otomo in view of Shima, et al and Seymour (US 6,343,675). This basis for rejection is respectfully traversed for the reasons noted above.

Accordingly, it is believed that the rejections under 35 U.S.C. §103 have been overcome by the foregoing amendment and remarks, and it is submitted that the claims are in condition for allowance. Reconsideration of this application as amended is respectfully requested. Allowance of all claims is earnestly solicited.

Respectfully submitted,



James A. Deland
Reg. No. 31,242

DELAND LAW OFFICE
P.O. Box 69
Klamath River, California 96050
(530) 465-2430